Dear Mr. Thomas,

I write in regard to a proceeding currently under review, 04-151.

I support the position presented by the Digital Tribal Village and the CUWiN project developed at Champaign-Urbana, in Illinois.

From the position of noncommercial wireless broadband providers, we believe a balance can be struck between high power and low power devices to maximize spectral efficiency in the band under discussion, $3650-3700 \, \mathrm{MHz}$.

The key to community wireless deployment lies in mesh technologies.

There are several aspects of mesh technology to be understood.

Experience in the field of community wireless provision has shown that allowing low power mobile devices in the band is critical to expanding mesh.

Low power mesh requires non-exclusivity and cheap equipment.

The Commission should not impose overly conservative interference protection criteria that drive up price. Flexibility has been critical to the success of unlicensed as a networking solution.

Mesh devices must be allowed to communicate with each other in a peer-to-peer fashion, rather than requiring mesh devices to communicate with a high power base station.

Any system of licensing or registration must be non-exclusive; the Commission should not create a "first in time, first in right" licensing systems.

Respectfully,

Michael Maranda President, The Association For Community Networking